

**Remarks/Arguments**

**35 USC § 102**

Claims 1 to 18, all of the Claims in the Application, have been rejected as being anticipated by US published application US 2003/0134638 to Sundar et al. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this rejection.

The Examiner has asserted, with respect to Claims 1 and 11, that Sundar teaches maintaining packet data protocol context while servicing a request using the WLAN. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this assertion. Nowhere does the reference to Sundar et al show or suggest:

“maintaining packet data protocol context while servicing the request using the wireless local area network”

as specifically recited in Claims 1 and 11. Rather, in Sundar et al, upon successful detection of the beacon from the access point, the mobile station of the subscriber de-registers from the macro network and registers with the serving mobile switching center for the WLAN. See page 5, paragraph 0067. It is therefore clear that the reference to Sundar et al is not relevant to the invention defined by Claims 1 and 11.

Claims 2 to 10 are dependent from Claim 1, and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Claims 12 to 18 are dependent from Claim 11, and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 11.

The Applicants submit that the instant application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
SHAILY VERMA ET AL.

By: Catherine A. Ferguson  
Catherine A. Ferguson, Attorney  
Reg. No. 40,877  
(609) 734-6440

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing LLC  
Two Independence Way, Suite 200  
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

November 15, 2007